

properly.” Office Action at 3. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and the Examiner’s requirement for the following reasons.

As discussed in the telephonic interview with the Examiner, the terminology used in the present application is consistent with the standard use in the art. Scheinberg (U.S. Patent No. 5,625,307), cited within the present application, provides an example of such use. As shown in Fig. 2 of Scheinberg, the lower frequency input signal, RF, is upconverted to the higher frequency output signal, IF. Therefore, use of the term “upconverter” in the application is appropriate.

Further, Applicants have clearly and consistently used the term “upconverter” within the Specification. For example, the Section titled “Description of the Related Art,” states:

A frequency upconverter generally includes an RF amplifier to amplify a radio frequency (“RF”) input signal, a local oscillator (“LO”) to generate a LO signal and a mixer to combine the RF input and LO signals to generate an intermediate frequency.

Specification, page 1, lines 10-13.

In addition, claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “[a]n upconverter for modulating an input signal to provide an output signal having a higher frequency than said input signal.” Therefore, there is a clear and consistent use of the term upconverter within the present application, in a manner in harmony with usage in the art.

In view of the remarks above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st and 2nd paragraphs. Applicants also respectfully request reconsideration and timely allowance of pending claims 1-31.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Richard V. Burgujian

Dated: November 23, 2004

By: *Robert E. Elmer* #27,432
Richard V. Burgujian
Reg. No. 31,744